

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7       UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
8    Plaintiff,  
9    v.  
10      ALTON STRICKLAND,  
11    Defendant.

1  
2  
3  
4    UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5    NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6  
7    Case No. 11-cr-00203-PJH-1

8  
9    **ORDER DENYING MOTION TO**  
10    **DISMISS SUPERVISED RELEASE**  
11    **VIOULATION HOLD/WARRANT**

12  
13    Re: Dkt. No. 8

14    Before the court is the motion of defendant Alton Strickland, appearing pro se,  
15    stating that he is currently in state custody and seeking dismissal of the pending  
16    hold/warrant and/or detainer against him for his supervised release violations. See Dkt.  
17    8.

18    The instant motion to dismiss seeks the same relief that was sought in defendant's  
19    earlier filed motion to compel issuance of a writ of habeas corpus ad prosequendum to  
20    require the state to deliver him to this court to appear on alleged violations of his  
21    supervised release conditions (Dkt. 2) and motion for an order requiring defendant's  
22    appearance in court (Dkt. 6).

23    The court denied defendant's earlier filed motions on the ground that he is not  
24    entitled to have the court adjudicate the alleged violations of his conditions of supervised  
25    release while he is in state custody. See Dkt. 3, Dkt. 7. The same reasoning applies to  
26    the instant motion. Under Ninth Circuit authority, due process concerns "are not triggered  
27    when the warrant is placed as a detainer at an institution where the probationer or  
28    parolee is already in custody awaiting disposal of an intervening charge or serving a

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 sentence for a crime committed while on supervised release." United States v. Wickham,  
2 618 F.2d 1307, 1309, n.3 (9th Cir. 1979) (citing Moody v. Daggett, 429 U.S. 78 (1976)).  
3 See United States v. Garrett, 253 F.3d 443, 450 (9th Cir. 2001) (holding that a district  
4 court may postpone the federal adjudication of alleged supervised release violations until  
5 after the defendant is released from state custody). While defendant now phrases his  
6 motion as being based on "due diligence of law" rather than "due process," the analysis  
7 and result are the same – while defendant is in state custody, the adjudication of alleged  
8 federal supervised release violations may be postponed.

9 Accordingly, for the reasons set forth in the orders denying defendant's motion for  
10 writ of habeas corpus ad prosequendum (Dkt. 3) and denying defendant's motion for an  
11 order requiring a court appearance on his supervised release violations (Dkt. 7), the  
12 instant motion to dismiss the pending supervised release violation hold/warrant and/or  
13 detainer is DENIED. Any request for an evidentiary hearing is also denied.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 Dated: November 22, 2022

16 /s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton  
17 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
18 United States District Judge

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28